arXiv:1701.07885v1 [math.FA] 26 Jan 2017

A P.C.F. Self-Similar Set with no Self-Similar Energy

Roberto Peirone

Università di Roma "Tor Vergata", Dipartimento di Matematica
via della Ricerca Scientifica, 00133, Roma, Italy
e.mail: peirone@mat.uniroma2.it

Abstract *A general class of finitely ramified fractals is that of P.C.F. self-similar sets. An important open problem in analysis on fractals was whether there exists a self-similar energy on every P.C.F. self-similar set. In this paper, I solve the problem, showing an example of a P.C.F. self-similar set where there exists no self-similar energy.*

1. Introduction.

An important problem in analysis of fractals is the construction of a Laplace operator, or equivalently, an energy, more precisely, a self-similar Dirichlet form. The construction of a self-similar Dirichlet form has been investigated specially on finitely ramified fractals. Roughly speaking, a fractal is finitely ramified if the intersection of each pair of copies of the fractal is a finite set. The Sierpinski Gasket, the Vicsek Set and the Lindstrøm Snowflake are finitely ramified fractals, while the Sierpinski Carpet is not.

More specially, we consider the P.C.F. self similar-sets, a general class of finitely ramified fractals introduced by Kigami in [3]. A general theory with many examples can be found in [4]. On such a class of fractals, the basic tool used to construct a self-similar Dirichlet form is a *discrete* Dirichlet form defined on a special finite subset $V^{(0)}$ of the fractal. Such discrete Dirichlet forms have to be *eigenforms*, i.e. the eigenvectors of a special nonlinear operator Λ_r called *renormalization operator*, which depends on a set of positive *weights* r_i placed on the cells of the fractal. In [5], [10] and [6] criteria for the existence of an eigenform with prescribed weights are discussed. In particular, in [5], T. Lindstrøm proved that there exists an eigenform on the nested fractals with all weights equal to 1, C. Sabot in [10] proved a rather general criterion, and V. Metz in [6] improved the results in [10].

In [1], [7], [8] and [9], instead, the problem is considered whether on a given fractal there exists a *G-eigenform*. By this we mean a form E which is an eigenform of the operator Λ_r for some set of weights r. In such papers the existence of a G-eigenform was proved on some classes of P.C.F. self-similar sets. In fact, the following open problem is well-known

Does a G-eigenform exist on every P.C.F.self-similar set?

In this paper, I solve such a problem showing an example of P.C.F.self-similar set with no G-eigenform. Here, I consider a very general class of P.C.F. self-similar sets, as usually in my previous papers on this topic (see Section 2 for the details), but also in other papers (for example it is considered in [11]. The example is constructed in Section 3. It is a variant of the N-Gaskets, in the sense that every cell V_i only intesects V_{i-1} and V_{i+1}, and has twenty vertices. The ptoof is based on the evaluation of the effective conductivities on pairs of close vertices and of far vertices. Note that in [9] the existence of a G-eigenform is proved on every fractal (of the class considered here) but only if we consider the fractal

generated by a set of similarities which is not necessarily the given set of similarities (see [9] for the details).

2. Definitions and Notation.

I will now define the fractal setting, which is based on that in [9]. This kind of approach was firstly given in [2]. We define a fractal by giving a *fractal triple*, i.e., a triple $\mathcal{F} := (V^{(0)}, V^{(1)}, \Psi)$ where $V^{(0)} = V$ and $V^{(1)}$ are finite sets with $\#V^{(0)} \geq 2$, and Ψ is a finite set of one-to-one maps from $V^{(0)}$ into $V^{(1)}$ satisfying

$$V^{(1)} = \bigcup_{\psi \in \Psi} \psi(V^{(0)}) .$$

We put $V^{(0)} = \{P_1, ..., P_N\}$, and of course $N \geq 2$. A set of the form $\psi(V^{(0)})$ with $\psi \in \Psi$ will be called a cell or a 1-cell. We require that

a) For each $j = 1, ..., N$ there exists a (unique) map $\psi_j \in \Psi$ such that $\psi_j(P_j) = P_j$, and $\Psi = \{\psi_1, ..., \psi_k\}$, with $k \geq N$.

b) $P_j \notin \psi_i(V^{(0)})$ when $i \neq j$ (in other words, if $\psi_i(P_h) = P_j$ with $i = 1, ..., k$, $j, h = 1, ..., N$, then $i = j = h$).

c) Any two points in $V^{(1)}$ can be connected by a path any edge of which belongs to a 1-cell, depending of the edge.

Of course, it immediately follows $V^{(0)} \subseteq V^{(1)}$. Let $W =]0, +\infty[^k$ and put $V_i = \psi_i(V^{(0)})$ for each $i = 1, ..., k$. Let $J(= J(V)) = \{\{j_1, j_2\} : j_1, j_2 = 1, ..., N, j_1 \neq j_2\}$. It is well-known that on every fractal triple we can construct a P.C.F.-self-similar set.

We denote by $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{F})$ or simply $\mathcal{D}$ the set of the Dirichlet forms on V, invariant with respect to an additive constant, i.e., the set of the functionals E from $\mathbb{R}^V$ into $\mathbb{R}$ of the form

$$E(u) = \sum_{\{j_1, j_2\} \in J} c_{\{j_1, j_2\}}(E)\big(u(P_{j_1}) - u(P_{j_2})\big)^2$$

with $c_{\{j_1, j_2\}}(E) \geq 0$. I will denote by $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{F})$ or simply $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ the set of the irreducible Dirichlet forms, i.e., $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ if $E \in \mathcal{D}$ and moreover $E(u) = 0$ if and only if u is constant. The numbers $c_{\{j_1, j_2\}}(E)$ are called *coefficients* of E. We also say that $c_{\{j_1, j_2\}}(E)$ is the *conductivity* between P_{j_1} and P_{j_2} (with respect to E). Next, I recall the notion of effective conductivity. Let $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$, and let $j_1, j_2 = 1, ..., N$, $j_1 \neq j_2$. Then we put

$$\mathcal{L}_{V;j_1,j_2} = \big\{u \in \mathbb{R}^V : u(P_{j_1}) = 0, u(P_{j_2}) = 1\big\}.$$

It can be easily proved that the minimum $\min\{E(u) : u \in \mathcal{L}_{V;j_1,j_2}\}$ exists, is attained at a unique function, and amounts to $\min\{E(u) : u \in \mathcal{L}_{V;j_2,j_1}\}$. So, for $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\{j_1, j_2\} \in J$, we define $\widetilde{C}_{\{j_1, j_2\}}(E)(= \widetilde{C}_{j_1,j_2}(E))$ by

$$\widetilde{C}_{\{j_1, j_2\}}(E) = \min\{E(u) : u \in \mathcal{L}_{V;j_1,j_2}\} = \min\{E(u) : u \in \mathcal{L}_{V;j_2,j_1}\}.$$

The value $\widetilde{C}_{\{j_1,j_2\}}(E)$ or short $\widetilde{C}_{\{j_1,j_2\}}$, is called *effective conductivity* between P_{j_1} and P_{j_2} (with respect to E). Note that $\widetilde{C}_{\{j_1,j_2\}} > 0$. The following remark can be easily verified (see Remark 2.9 in [9].

Remark 2.1. If $j_1, j_2 = 1, ..., N$, $j_1 \neq j_2$, and $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$, then

$$\min\left\{E(u) : u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}} : u(P_{j_1}) = t_1, u(P_{j_2}) = t_2\right\} = (t_1 - t_2)^2\, \widetilde{C}_{\{j_1,j_2\}}.$$

Recall that for every $r \in W :=]0, +\infty[^k$, $(r_i := r(i))$ the *renormalization operator* is defined as follows: for every $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and every $u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$,

$$\Lambda_r(E)(u) = \inf\Big\{S_{1,r}(E)(v), v \in \mathcal{L}(u)\Big\},$$

$$S_{1,r}(E)(v) := \sum_{i=1}^{k} r_i E(v \circ \psi_i), \quad \mathcal{L}(u) := \left\{v \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(1)}} : v = u \text{ on } V^{(0)}\right\}.$$

It is well known that $\Lambda_r(E) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and that the infimum is attained at a unique function $v := H_{1,E;r}(u)$. When $r \in W$, an element E of $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ is said to be an *r-eigenform* with *eigenvalue* $\rho > 0$ if $\Lambda_r(E) = \rho E$. As this amounts to $\Lambda_{\frac{r}{\rho}}(E) = E$, we could also require $\rho = 1$. The problem discussed in the present paper is that of the existence of a G-eigenform in $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$, in other words, the existence of $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ such that $\Lambda_r(E) = \rho E$ for some $\rho > 0$ and $r \in W$. In next section, I will describe an example of a fractal triple where there exists no G-eigenform. To this aim, it will be useful the following standard lemma (see e.g., Lemma 3.3 in [9].

Lemma 2.2 *For every $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\{j_1, j_2\} \in J$ we have*

$$\widetilde{C}_{\{j_1,j_2\}}\big(\Lambda_r(E)\big) = \min\left\{S_{1,r}(E)(v) : v \in H_{j_1,j_2}\right\},$$
$$\text{where } \; H_{j_1,j_2} = \left\{v \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(1)}} : v(P_{j_1}) = 0, v(P_{j_2}) = 1\right\}.$$

3. The Example.

Let $\overline{\mathcal{F}} = (V^{(0)}, V^{(1)}, \Psi)$ be a fractal triple so defined. Let $N = 2N'$ be a positive even number. Let $V^{(0)} = \{P_1, ..., P_N\}$, and we fix $N' = 10$ so $N = 20$. Let $\Psi = \{\psi_1, ..., \psi_{20}\}$. Here, thus, $N = k = 20$. In the following, the indices of the points and of the maps will be meant to be mod 20. For example, $i + 9 = 2$ if $i = 13$. Suppose $V_i \cap V_{i'} = \varnothing$ if $i' \notin \{i, i-1, i+1\}$, and

$$V_i \cap V_{i+1} = \{\overline{Q}_i\}, \quad \overline{Q}_i = \begin{cases} \psi_i(P_{i+1}) = \psi_{i+1}(P_i) & \text{if } i \text{ odd}, \\ \psi_i(P_{i+9}) = \psi_{i+1}(P_{i-8}) & \text{if } i \text{ even}. \end{cases}$$

In this way $\overline{Q}_{i-1} = \psi_i(P_{\sigma(i)})$, $\overline{Q}_i = \psi_i(P_{\sigma(i)+10})$, with $\sigma(i) = \begin{cases} i-1 \text{ if } i \text{ even}, \\ i-9 \text{ if } i \text{ odd}. \end{cases}$ Thus the points $\overline{Q}_i$ and $\overline{Q}_{i-1}$ are opposite in V_i. Here we say that P_h and P_{h+10} are opposite in

$V^{(0)}$ and that $\psi_i(P_h)$ and $\psi_i(P_{h+10})$ are opposite in V_i. In order to prove Theorem 3.2, we could use arguments based on effective resistances in series, but, in order to avoid some slightly technical points, I prefer to give a direct proof. We need the following well known lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *For every positive integer n and every $b_i > 0$, $i = 1, ..., n$, we have*

$$\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i^{-1}\Big)^{-1} = \min\Big\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i x_i^2 : x \in Y_n\Big\}, \quad Y_n := \Big\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i = 1\Big\}.$$

Proof. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i x_i^2$. Since f is continuous and $f(x) \longrightarrow_{x\to\infty} +\infty$, f attains a minimum m on the closed set Y_n at some point $\overline{x}$. We find $\overline{x}$ using the Lagrange multiplier rule. We have $b_i\overline{x}_i = \lambda$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and every $i = 1, ..., n$. Thus, $1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \overline{x}_i = \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i^{-1}$, and $\overline{x}_i = \lambda b_i^{-1} = b_i^{-1}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j^{-1}\Big)^{-1}$. Since $m = f(\overline{x})$, a simple calculation completes the proof. ∎

Theorem 3.2. *On $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ there exists no G-eigenform.*

Proof. Suppose by contradiction there exist $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and $r \in W$ such that $\Lambda_r(E) = E$. Of course, in view of Lemma 2.2, this implies

$$\widetilde{C}_{\{j_1,j_2\}}(E) = \min\big\{S_{1,r}(E)(v) : v \in H_{j_1,j_2}\big\} \quad \forall\, \{j_1, j_2\} \in J. \tag{3.1}$$

Now, let $\overline{r} = \max\Big\{\min\{r_{2h+1}, r_{2h+2}\} : h = 0, ..., 9\Big\}$. Thus,

$$\exists\, \overline{h} = 0, ..., 9 : \forall\, d = 1, 2 : r_{2\overline{h}+d} \geq \overline{r}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\forall\, h = 0, ..., 9\ \exists\, d = 1, 2 : r_{2h+d} \leq \overline{r}. \tag{3.3}$$

Next, we evaluate $\widetilde{C}_{2\overline{h}+1,2\overline{h}+2}(E)$ using (3.1). Let $v \in H_{2\overline{h}+1,2\overline{h}+2}$. Then, since by definition $S_{1,r}(E)(v) = \sum_{i=1}^{20} r_i E(v \circ \psi_i) \geq \sum_{d=1}^{2} r_{2\overline{h}+d} E(v \circ \psi_{2\overline{h}+d})$, in view of (3.2) we have

$$S_{1,r}(E)(v) \geq \overline{r}\big(E(v \circ \psi_{2\overline{h}+1}) + E(v \circ \psi_{2\overline{h}+2})\big). \tag{3.4}$$

Let $t = v(\overline{Q}_{2\overline{h}+1})$. Let $v_1 = v \circ \psi_{2\overline{h}+1}$, $v_2 = v \circ \psi_{2\overline{h}+2}$. Then we have

$$v_1(P_{2\overline{h}+1}) = v(P_{2\overline{h}+1}) = 0, \quad v_1(P_{2\overline{h}+2}) = v\big(\psi_{2\overline{h}+1}(P_{2\overline{h}+2})\big) = v(\overline{Q}_{2\overline{h}+1}) = t,$$

$$v_2(P_{2\overline{h}+2}) = v(P_{2\overline{h}+2}) = 1, \quad v_2(P_{2\overline{h}+1}) = v\big(\psi_{2\overline{h}+2}(P_{2\overline{h}+1})\big) = v(\overline{Q}_{2\overline{h}+1}) = t.$$

By Remark 2.1 and Lemma 3.1 with $n = 2$, we thus have

$$E(v \circ \psi_{2\overline{h}+1}) + E(v \circ \psi_{2\overline{h}+2}) \geq \big(t^2 + (1-t)^2\big)\widetilde{C}_{2\overline{h}+1,2\overline{h}+2}(E) \geq \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{C}_{2\overline{h}+1,2\overline{h}+2}(E).$$

By (3.4) and (3.1) we have $\widetilde{C}_{2\overline{h}+1,2\overline{h}+2}(E) \geq \dfrac{\overline{r}}{2}\widetilde{C}_{2\overline{h}+1,2\overline{h}+2}(E)$, thus

$$\overline{r} \leq 2. \tag{3.5}$$

Let now $\widehat{l} = 1, ..., 20$ be so that

$$\widetilde{C}_{\widehat{l},\widehat{l}+10}(E) \geq \widetilde{C}_{l,l+10}(E) \quad \forall\, l = 1, ..., 20. \tag{3.6}$$

Note that, in view of Remark 2.1, for every $i = 1, ..., 20$ and every $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists $u_{i,t_1,t_2} \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$ such that

$$u_{i,t_1,t_2}(P_i) = t_1,\ u_{i,t_1,t_2}(P_{i+10}) = t_2,\ E(u_{i,t_1,t_2}) = (t_1 - t_2)^2\, \widetilde{C}_{i,i+10}(E). \tag{3.7}$$

Next, define $v \in H_{\widehat{l},\widehat{l}+10}$, in terms of $x, x' \in Y_9$. Given such x, x' let $s(n) = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} x_i$, $s'(n) = 1 - \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} x'_i$ for $n = 0, ..., 9$. Let $v \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(1)}}$ be so that

$$v \circ \psi_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = \widehat{l} \\ 1 & \text{if } i = \widehat{l} + 10 \\ u_{\sigma(i),s(i-\widehat{l}-1),s(i-\widehat{l})} & \text{if } i = \widehat{l}+1, ..., \widehat{l}+9, \\ u_{\sigma(i),s'(i-\widehat{l}-11),s'(i-\widehat{l}-10)} & \text{if } i = \widehat{l}+11, ..., \widehat{l}+19. \end{cases}$$

We easily see that the definition of v is correct, i.e., the definition of v at the points $\overline{Q}_i$ (the only points lying in different cells) is independent of the two representations of $\overline{Q}_i$, that is, $\overline{Q}_i = \psi_i(P_{\sigma(i)+10})$ and $\overline{Q}_i = \psi_{i+1}(P_{\sigma(i+1)})$. Moreover, as $P_{\widehat{l}} = \psi_{\widehat{l}}(P_{\widehat{l}})$, and $P_{\widehat{l}+10} = \psi_{\widehat{l}+10}(P_{\widehat{l}+10})$. we immediately see that $v \in H_{\widehat{l},\widehat{l}+10}$. Since $E(v \circ \psi_{\widehat{l}}) = E(v \circ \psi_{\widehat{l}+10}) = 0$, we have

$$S_{1,r}(E)(v) = \sum_{i=\widehat{l}}^{\widehat{l}+19} r_i E(v \circ \psi_i) = \Big(\sum_{i=\widehat{l}+1}^{\widehat{l}+9} r_i E(v \circ \psi_i) + \sum_{i=\widehat{l}+11}^{\widehat{l}+19} r_i E(v \circ \psi_i) \Big)$$

$$= \sum_{i=\widehat{l}+1}^{\widehat{l}+9} r_i E\big(u_{\sigma(i),s(i-\widehat{l}-1),s(i-\widehat{l})}\big) + \sum_{i=\widehat{l}+11}^{\widehat{l}+19} r_i E\big(u_{\sigma(i),s'(i-\widehat{l}-11),s'(i-\widehat{l}-10)}\big)$$

$$= \sum_{i=\widehat{l}+1}^{\widehat{l}+9} r_i\ \widetilde{C}_{\sigma(i),\sigma(i+10)}\ x^2_{i-\widehat{l}} + \sum_{i=\widehat{l}+11}^{\widehat{l}+19} r_i\ \widetilde{C}_{\sigma(i),\sigma(i+10)}\ (x'_{i-\widehat{l}-10})^2 \qquad \text{by (3.7)}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{9} r_{i+\widehat{l}}\, \widetilde{C}_{\sigma(i+\widehat{l}),\sigma(i+\widehat{l})+10}\ x_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{9} r_{i+\widehat{l}+10} \widetilde{C}_{\sigma(i+\widehat{l}+10),\sigma(i+\widehat{l}+10)+10}\ (x'_i)^2$$

$$\leq \widetilde{C}_{\widehat{l,l}+10}(E)\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{9} r_{i+\widehat{l}}\, x_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{9} r_{i+\widehat{l}+10}(x_i')^2\Big). \qquad \text{by (3.6)}$$

So far we have taken arbitrary $x, x' \in Y_9$. Now take those $x, x' \in Y_9$ that minimize the sums in previous formula. By Lemma 3.1, with this v we have

$$S_{1,r}(E)(v) \leq \widetilde{C}_{\widehat{l,l}+10}(E)\Big(\big(\sum_{i=1}^{9}(r_{i+\widehat{l}})^{-1}\big)^{-1} + \big(\sum_{i=1}^{9}(r_{i+\widehat{l}+10})^{-1}\big)^{-1}\Big). \qquad (3.8)$$

By (3.3), for at least four $i = 1, ..., 9$ we have $r_{i+\widehat{l}} \leq \overline{r}$, so $\big(\sum_{i=1}^{9}(r_{i+\widehat{l}})^{-1}\big)^{-1} < \frac{\overline{r}}{4}$. Similarly, $\big(\sum_{i=1}^{9}(r_{i+\widehat{l}+10})^{-1}\big)^{-1} < \frac{\overline{r}}{4}$. Since $v \in H_{\widehat{l,l}+10}$, by (3.8) and (3.1) we have

$$\widetilde{C}_{\widehat{l,l}+10}(E) \leq S_{1,r}(E)(v) < \frac{\overline{r}}{2}\widetilde{C}_{\widehat{l,l}+10}(E).$$

Thus, $\overline{r} > 2$, which contradicts (3.5). ∎

References

[1] B.M. Hambly, V. Metz, A. Teplyaev, *Self-similar energies on post-critically finite self-similar fractals*, J. London Math Soc. (2) 74, pp. 93-112, 2006

[2] K.Hattori, T. Hattori, H. Watanabe, *Gaussian field theories on general networks and the spectral dimension*, Progr. Theoret. Phys. Suppl. 92, pp. 108-143, 1987

[3] J. Kigami, *Harmonic calculus on p.c.f. self-similar sets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 335, pp.721-755, 1993

[4] J. Kigami, *Analysis on fractals*, Cambridge University Press, 2001

[5] T. Lindström, *Brownian motion on nested fractals*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 83 No. 420, 1990

[6] V. Metz, *The short-cut test*, J. Funct. Anal. 220, pp. 118-156, 2005

[7] R. Peirone, *Existence of eigenforms on fractals with three vertices*, Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A 137, 2007

[8] R. Peirone, *Existence of eigenforms on nicely separated fractals*, in *Analysis of graphs and its applications*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, pp. 231-241, 2008

[9] R. Peirone, *Existence of self-similar energies on finitely ramified fractals*, Journal d'Analyse Mathmatique Volume 123 Issue 1, pp. 35-94, 2014

[10] C. Sabot, *Existence and uniqueness of diffusions on finitely ramified self-similar fractals*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) 30, pp. 605-673, 1997

[11] R.S. Strichartz, *Differential equations on fractals: a tutorial*, Princeton University Press, 2006